

THE  
CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

---

VOL. II.

JUNE, 1825.

No. 6.

---

CHRISTIANITY ITS OWN WITNESS.

Man, from his infancy, is so familiar with the operations of nature around him, that some just idea of the relation of effects to their causes early, becomes a principle interwoven in the mind. He not only discovers a propensity to trace up both natural and moral phenomena to some antecedent events, which, from their connexion, might seem to be the real causes; he also possesses an almost perfect sagacity to discern the fitness of things, which, like an intellectual conscience, promptly decides on the credibility of these claims. There is something at once so simple and sublime in the true system of physical nature, as secures to its newly discovered principles the swiftest verdict both of reason and emotion. And the human mind not only recognizes with joy the light of truth, but feels a mysterious disquietude in the embrace of error. Every one, therefore, in his inquiries into natural science, is

sensibly urged forward by these principles of his nature, as far as finite power and opposing prejudices will admit, towards a discovery of the hidden springs whose energy is the omnipotence of God.

The progress of astronomical researches furnishes an ample illustration of this remark. Though theories of the planetary motions have existed ever since the days of Egypt's wakeful shepherds, yet the restless mind of man was never satisfied; but reason, while she lingered in the successive mazes of Tycho and Ptolemy, still sought some other light—she knew not why, till Copernicus enthroned the sun and Newton pointed to the power which curbs the spheres. And there is something in those principles, so simple in itself—so like the counsels of the universal cause, that a single glance at them conveys to the understanding the heavenly expression of truth. Reason feels that she has reached the boundary of this field of being, and even curiosity can ask no more below.

But the powers of this internal perception are not confined to the region of natural science, they accompany the mind in all its religious and moral speculations.— They give a degree of stability to human reason which enables it to venture far from the shores of sense into the wide expanse where things are spiritually discerned. It is scarcely too much to suppose that this is the principle which links each created intelligence to the eternal mind—so God-like have been its operations, wherever it has burst the chains of prejudice and emerged from the darkness of sin.

To say nothing of the subordinate truths, which, by its assistance, have been elicited from the arcana of science, it is this which in all ages, has led the mind from nature up to God; and taught it the essential attributes of the Divinity. The confidence which men have reposed in the responses of this oracle within, is the ground of every conviction which belongs to natural religion. Of this the Poet was aware when he made the father of our race thus describe the first workings of his thoughts.

“——As new waked from the soundest sleep,  
Soft on the flowery herb I found me laid  
In balmy sweat——  
Straight toward heaven my wondering eyes I turned,  
And gazed a while the ample sky; till raised  
By quick instinctive motion up I sprung;  
About me round I saw

Hill, dale, and shady woods and sunny plains,  
And liquid lapse of murmuring streams;  
by these  
Creatures that lived and moved and walked, or flew,  
Myself I then perused.

——Thou sun, said I, fair light  
And thou enlightened earth, so fresh and gay;  
Ye hills and dales, ye rivers, woods and plains,  
And ye that live and move, fair creatures tell,  
Tell, if ye saw how I came thus, how here?  
Not of myself;———By some great Maker then,  
In goodness and in power pre-eminent.”

I need not say how true to nature this description is. There is no man who does not feel the same internal dictate whenever he goes forth among the works of God. We may be assured that we are approved by the consciences of men when we fix the charge of self-violence upon those who impiously ascribe the fair creation to the efficiency of chance. Human reason has ever been truer to her Maker than the human heart. Yet, dragged reluctantly into the rebellion, she is sometimes bribed and sometimes tortured for decisions, which, at the time, she suffers to falter on her lips, and renounces with the first indulgence of freedom.— Though I am aware that the errors of reason may sometimes be imputed to that frailty of her own which suffers her to be led astray by the pride of originality; yet, in either case, her severest labor seems to be an inward struggle to smother those responses, which,

at least, *resemble* the inspirations of Omniscience.

If then, this principle of reason be allowed its agency in establishing the truth of natural religion, it must extend its influence beyond these limits. No reason can be assigned why the origin of revelation would not be accessible in the same way as the origin of nature, though the former were unknown. Much less can it be shown, that, after arriving at the knowledge of a sufficient cause, it is either unphilosophical or unsafe to return by the same steps to the discovery of its other characteristic effects. Surely, if the works of material nature retain such an impress of the Divinity as enables us to read in them his agency, and many of his attributes, we may expect to find in a system of truth, adapted to the state of man as an intellectual and moral being, such lineaments of that glorious design, which nature's light shows dwelling in the mind of God, as shall fully entitle it to the honor of being his fairest work, and to the regard, which, by consequence it claims from man.

From the contemplation of that being, who gave life and motion to the universe, and disposed all its parts with an evident regard to harmony and happiness—a being, possessed of infinite attributes—Benevolence, to guide the dictates of his will—Omniscience, to discover the surest means for its accomplishment—and Omnipotence,

to command all the energies of matter and mind, we return with the certain conviction that there is no effect in the universe proportioned to the efficiency of such a cause, if the system of moral operations revealed in the bible, is not true. The mind is pained at the reflection. It instinctively abhors the idea of a being, infinitely intelligent and wise, existing without action, or operating in vain. Again, if we examine the christian religion—the features which it presents of whatever is beautiful in truth, or sublime in virtue, the marks of some design elevated by the majesty of its plans, and hallowed by the purity of its object, the leading influence which it exerts in advancing the moral dignity and happiness of man—these all proclaim that the God of nature only is equal to the effort manifested in the formation and conduct of the glorious scheme.

These two general reflections will be sufficient to satisfy the pious mind that the precious gospel is not a cunningly devised fable. For he has not, like other men, to struggle with a heart reluctant to admit the discovery of truth, which wounds his natural pride and inflicts on the self-complacent quietude of his bosom, the consciousness of guilt. Still a short analysis of the argument upon which such a conviction rests, may enable him to feel more distinctly the extent and firmness of the foundation on which his all relies; and may



serve to kindle his affections into a more steady flame upon the altar of an unshaken trust in God.

The two following inquiries, then, lead to a more particular view of the considerations already suggested.

How may we infer from the character of God that he is the author of christianity?

And how may the same thing be inferred from the character of our religion itself?

To the former of these it may be replied

1st. That it is inconsistent with the benevolence of the Deity that he should not design for his creatures the most exalted happiness of which they are capable.

God is the former of our bodies and the father of our spirits. The springs of our being are in him, and each susceptibility of our nature is the gift of his creating hand. In some of these endowments lie the fairest proofs of the divine goodness which have sustained the speculations of natural religion.— In what an endless variety of beauty has the Creator wrapped the external world for no other perceptible purpose than to delight the corporeal senses of man! What a variety of social relations has he devised to excite the sensibilities and gratify the affections of the human breast! None of the noble passions that dilate the heart of patriotism or philanthropy are left to languish for want of an object. No human capacity must necessarily run to waste, no wish

must of necessity, be made in vain.

But while there is something in nature to exercise every power and to meet every innocent desire of man, in this incipient state of his existence, there is nothing imperishable as the mind on which its *immortal* desires can feed, if the bible is not true. Without the bible, the future world is a desert and eternity a winter to the soul! How, then, can it be consistent with the benevolence of God, conspicuous in the blessings of our present state, that he should be so indifferent to the immortal interests of the soul, as to give us no more knowledge of future retributions than the light of nature suggests; and absolutely more discernible by unassisted reason respecting the principles by which he will be guided in dispensing them. Will infinite goodness descend to secure the minutest happiness of man, and yet leave him a defenceless prey to the malignant arts of Satan? Can that be a hand of kindness, which carefully sustains our bark along the trembling stream of time that it may be wrecked upon the billows of eternity? If not, then the Creator has left no means untried, which infinite love could devise to save the souls of men.

2d. Our knowledge of God enables us to conclude that the means he employs to effect the spiritual welfare of his creatures are such as tend to assimilate them to his own moral likeness.



The blessed God knows that he is the happiest of all beings. He perceives, too, that his happiness flows from the perfections of his moral nature. It consists in the complacency which he feels in his own purity, integrity and benevolent affections. It cannot be, therefore, that the ultimate happiness, which he designs for man, is very different in kind from this. The creature who bears the natural image of his Maker, must be wretched in a spiritual existence without similar dispositions of soul. Endowed, as man is, with the perception and internal approbation of moral excellence, he cannot be made more miserable than by being brought unsanctified into eternity, whose light shall disclose to him his soul's irreparable void.—Man, then must resemble his Maker before his natural capacity for bliss can be supplied. Therefore we may certainly conclude that the designs of infinite benevolence embrace the best possible means for effecting such a renovation of the human character as will bring it to a near conformity with God. We are led by the light of reason to expect some interposition of the Deity to accomplish this purpose of his heart—some plan of salvation, not less conspicuous than the gospel of Christ.

II. How may it be inferred from the character of christianity itself that God is its author.

It was just remarked that the mind, in some measure enlightened

by the truths of rational religion, naturally anticipates the discovery of some system of divine operation tending to the moral improvement of man. Let us then examine the christian religion, with the aid of such a criteria as are furnished to our minds, by our independent knowledge of God and his designs.

1st. The system of doctrines and duties contained in the bible bears evident marks of a divine original.

This remark applies to every truth and precept of the sacred volume. No portion of God's word shrinks from the ordeal challenged by such a claim. Even those doctrines which harmonize so far with the dictates of human wisdom, as not to be distinguished by a superficial view from the discoveries of reason, are found upon nearer inspection to leave their parallels infinitely behind, and to sustain relations manifestly divine.

But the God of the bible is a character in all points beyond the power of human invention to form. Men, so far from anticipating the peculiar features of the divine character have been slow to discern the master strokes by which it is delineated in revelation.—There is a tendency in the mind to give to its conceptions the shape of the ideas with which it is already familiar. Imagination itself cannot stretch its wild and wandering wing beyond the boundaries of human knowledge. Its most excentric flight is still among real

existences; and its most anomalous creations are only the ideas of the mind modified or combined anew. A glance at the theism of the Ancients, among whom genius has reared its proudest monuments compels us to make no exception to this principle in favor of religion. Amidst all their researches in science and refinements in theoretical virtue, they never departed from the analogy of nature in their notions of a supreme being. The perfections of *Pater Omnipotens* did not differ in kind from human perfections. They were invested with human forms and impelled by human passions.— Their power was as much obedient to the laws of nature, and as much limited to the instrumentality of means as that of men. The wicked under the light of revelation are charged with the folly of estimating the perfections of God by the same rule in the language of the Psalmist, “Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself.”

But the imbecility of human reason is not the only thing which has limited its discoveries. A depraved heart has always encumbered its march. It has disordered or blinded its perceptions of evidence and often wholly diverted it from the pursuit of truth. The preposterous reasoning of unenlightened men, if there were no other account of the matter, might be all ascribed to the natural prejudices of the mind. The Savior intimates, John v. 44. that it was

impossible for the Jews to perceive the evidence of his Messiahship, while they retained their carnal affections. Thus we see that the inadequacy of our finite apprehensions and the impulses of base desires unite to exclude from the mind of man a just knowledge of the true God. The description therefore of the being and attributes of the Deity, contained in the bible, is not a mere human production. The pencil which drew that matchless portrait was guided by the hand of the *Eternal*. The same, if necessary might be said of all the peculiar doctrines of revelation.

No less conspicuous is the divine origin of the morality taught in the bible. In comparing the works of pagan moralists with the scriptures, the christian, almost involuntarily, exclaims with the poet

“Great God, when once compared  
with thine,  
How mean their writings look !”

Place the ethics of Socrates and Seneca beside the sacred volume ! The lore which shone on the moral midnight of paganism becomes rayless in the noonlight of christianity. Virtue was with them, as with us, a name for the highest moral excellence; yet scarcely two things in the universe are to be found, so wide of each other as the virtue of heathen philosophy and that of the bible. One is that union of qualities which forms the character of the proud hero—an union of valour, courage, bravery, force and fortitude, the oth-

er that group of graces which adorn the unassuming followers of Jesus—love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. The first are not more inferior to the last in kind than in duration. The laurel fades and falls when the brow that wore it becomes cold in death. But the graces of the christian when they cease to be obscured by a body of sin, are constellated into a diadem to crown his immortal spirit.

The moral precepts of paganism respect only the external deportment, while those of christianity extend their dominion to the heart. They are the statutes by which an enlightened conscience sits to try the secret thoughts and affections of the heart. But how shall we account for such an important improvement upon "the philosophy, falsely so called," as we are presented with in the scriptures? It is perfectly natural to ascribe the former to the genius of man; for it displays the very imperfections which a finite capacity would overlook, and the errors which are, at this day, the offspring of a depraved taste. But the sacred books bear the impress of a more exalted original. Had their authors, then, more learning or acumen than the philosophers of polished Greece and Rome? Certainly not. Nor could they have obtained their notions of the peculiar morality of the bible from any source beside the oracle of heaven. He, who can believe that a

heathen composed the sermon on the mount should not censure the credulity of him who believes in the mysteries of revelation.

2d. Christianity is the most important means in operation for accomplishing the ends of infinite benevolence.

We have seen that it is the gracious design of God to make men happy by communicating to them his own moral likeness; and that such a design accompanied by infinite wisdom and might, must go forth towards its accomplishment in a train of secondary causes the most eligible for the purpose.

The fundamental truths of christianity are the same with those of natural religion. No one disputes their salutary influence, wherever they have made an impression on the mind of man; nor can any one reasonably doubt that the power of this good influence is increased in proportion to the distinctness and permanency of such impressions. Allowing, therefore, that the abstract principles of religion are as legible on the page of nature as of revelation, if it is plain that the latter is attended with circumstances, which give to these principles a cogency and effect unknown in natural religion, and unfelt by the bosom which is a stranger to the gospel, then there can no longer be any doubt that christianity is a plan adopted by infinite wisdom for the moral renovation of man.

Now upon the strength of principles equally clear to the infidel



and the christian we affirm that, aside from the distinctness and lustre which the bible, as a commentary upon the works of nature and providence, has given to moral truth, the christian religion infinitely transcends the religion of nature in its power to form the moral character into the image of God. Those truths in natural religion, which are plainest on the face of things, are still presented almost exclusively to the intellectual perception of men, and appeal to their feelings scarcely more than a geometrical proposition, while in the gospel they are bodied forth in the living examples, and addressed to every sense and sympathy of human nature.

The influence of example in the formation of character is exerted in two ways. In the first place, by presenting to our minds the abstract principles of moral action with the greatest possible distinctness.

Not only the dreams of fancy, but the deductions and demonstrations of reason itself, never attain to that life and reality, nor to that degree of familiarity with the thoughts, which accompany sensible knowledge. The power of contemplating those truths, which, like the relations in pure mathematics, have no types nor illustrations in the external world, is among the last acquisitions of the mind; and the fundamental doctrines of religion which by the methods of revelation are now

made plain to the simplest capacity, if they could be approached only by abstraction, might have remained forever remote from the apprehension of the mass of mankind. The love of country is a passion, which, in a greater or less degree, pervades the recesses of every bosom. Yet no one can peruse the story of Regulus without feeling that his idea of patriotism is improved and deepened by the contemplation of such an example? We may safely presume that the nature of moral principles is rendered as much more intelligible through the medium of actions, as the Elements of Euclid through that of diagrams. Whatever things God has allied in nature, are studied with the greatest advantage; and we might as well hope to comprehend the beauty of the human countenance from a verbal definition of it, as to gain an adequate idea of moral attributes from the mere *fitness of things*. When, therefore, we behold in revelation the principles of natural religion embodied in a palpable form; the perfections of God exemplified in an interesting course of divine conduct towards men; and the whole adapted to the powers of the human understanding; we are compelled to believe that christianity is the offspring of that divine benevolence which designed that the knowledge of God should effect the renovation of man.

But this is not all—the influence of example in the second

place, is exerted by its exciting the sympathetic emotion of virtue.—The sympathetic emotion of virtue is that feeling which arises in our minds on seeing or contemplating a virtuous action, disposing us in general to acts of a similar nature. For example, if we behold or read of a signal instance of gratitude, our admiration of the person is accompanied by a desire to perform acts of gratitude without any object. This latter is the emotion of which we speak; an emotion most favorable to the formation of moral character since it is excited by virtuous examples only and secretly prompts the mind to seek occasions for the useful exercise of virtuous principles and feelings. Lord Kaimes to whom we are already indebted, speaks of the utility of this emotion in the following words :

“The emotion under consideration bestows upon good example the utmost influence by prompting us to imitate what we admire. This singular emotion will readily find an object to exert itself upon, and at any rate it never exists without producing some effect, because virtuous emotions of that sort are in some degree an exercise of virtue ; they are a mental exercise at least if they appear not externally.—And every exercise of virtue, internal and external, leads to habit ; for a disposition or propensity of the mind like a limb of the body becomes stronger by exercise.—Thus by proper discipline every

person may acquire a settled habit of virtue, intercourse with men of worth, histories of generous and disinterested actions, and frequent meditation upon them, keep the sympathetic emotion in constant exercise, which, by degrees introduces a habit, and confirms the authority of virtue.”

Who can describe the effect of Regulus’ generous conduct upon the Roman Senate, at the moment when he needed only have spoken one word and it would have restored him to his liberty, his estate his dignity, his wife, his children, and his country—but that word appearing to him contrary to the honor and welfare of the state, he firmly renounced his home, and all that is dear to humanity, for exile, torture and the cross ! We may well imagine that every breast beat high with the courage and patriotic love, so conspicuous in their illustrious friend, and longed for a suitable opportunity to display its zeal in similar acts of devotedness. Never did patriotism taught by philosophy or celebrated in song, produce an impression like this ; because while speculation improves the intellect, and poetry delights the fancy, it is only the eloquence of example that can reach the deeper sympathies of the soul.

Now the system of religious truth which purports to have been revealed from heaven is most happily adapted to this susceptibility of our natures. However clearly the attributes of God were impress-

ed upon the creation, their feeble appeal was made to the understanding, not to the feelings of the heart. The natural earth and heavens, without the index of revelation, would have been almost a blank, as to any moral meaning, and proportionably dull in moral effect. The absence of some perfect example which the christian might admire and imitate, would be such a deficiency in the means of his moral health and happiness as nature would experience, if the sun from this moment should become a rayless world of ice.—But in the bible the truths of natural religion are clothed with the forms of intelligible actions; and the Deity, no longer perceived *only* in the clouds and winds, approaches man in the known and intimate relations, of father, friend, Savior, judge and rewarder. He has not only delineated his character in verbal expressions of his mind and will, but has come forth in those overtures of providence and grace which are calculated to appeal most powerfully to the sympathetic emotions of men.—The divine conduct towards the Jews, redemption by Christ, the life, sufferings and death of the Savior, the zeal and devotedness of inspired men, are so many features of the deity, in which, “we behold with open face, the glory of the Lord, and are changed into the same image from glory to glory.

God therefore must be the author of revelations, or their exists

in the universe an intelligent, benevolent, and infinite cause, criminally unemployed—christianity must be from above: or weak and depraved man has transcended the omniscience, efficiency, and grace of Jehovah, in the discovery and application of means to accomplish the purposes of the divine will. H.

---

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

The religious instruction of children and youth is a topic which ought frequently to be introduced and should be insisted on with more special earnestness, where there is evidence that the duty of giving such instruction is by many viewed with indifference and neglect. To my own mind, it has long appeared plain, that if any one duty could be proved to be reasonable, that of giving early religious instruction was a duty of that nature and that in nothing could, in consistency, be made to appear more palpable and striking than in a neglect to give religious instruction among those parents who acknowledged the importance of religion.

My design, in this paper, is to address parents affectionately, yet faithfully, and to urge, the reasonableness and importance of this duty in a way to produce conviction and cause a discharge of this serious and interesting obligation of parents to their children.



In the first place, the religious instruction of children is possible. It is no impracticable duty that is now recommended.

What has been done, may be done again; and religious instruction has often been bestowed by parents on their children. It has been probably given not only by the learned, who might be supposed to have more ability of imparting it; but by thousands in the common walks of life, with ordinary opportunities of gaining information. Nor does it require that children themselves should be gifted with any extraordinary powers of mind, in order to be capable of receiving instruction of this nature. As soon and as early as a child can receive any useful instruction, it can receive the first elements of religious knowledge. None doubt the possibility of teaching children on other subjects than religion. But the same capacity of acquiring and retaining instruction which they manifest in relation to other subjects is suited, also, to acquiring and retaining religious knowledge.

It has, indeed, been often found easier to give religious instruction than any other. The child is very easily interested in such representations as are suitable to be given him respecting God, and in many scripture narratives, such for instance, as the history of Abel, of Joseph, of Daniel, and others of the same kind. Their questions and observations, when

their attention is turned to such subjects, frequently shew, how much interest they feel in this kind of instruction and how much more capable they are of understanding it, than many seem to suppose, indeed, may it not be said, with too much truth, that religious knowledge is sometimes more interesting to the children, than to the parents, and that children are, in many cases, more ready to receive some knowledge of their God, their Savior, the scriptures and their duty, than parents are to afford it either by personal instruction, or by encouraging others to impart it to them.

When children become interested in the objects which animate and inanimate nature presents, it is, evidently, possible to refer them to the Great Author. When they perceive their relation to their earthly parents and are capable of realizing their obligations of love, gratitude and obedience to them, is it not possible, to tell them of a heavenly parent to whom they are under still stronger obligations? Is it impossible, that they should be early taught to act with a reference to the all-seeing eye of God, to seek to please him and to fear his displeasure? All this, and much more, is not only possible, but easy.

As it respects the possibility of giving religious instruction to children, there cannot be ground for controversy. Knowledge, much more difficult, is taught

them both at home and at school, and at both, it is possible for this kind of information to be imparted, if parents encourage it. Considering it therefore, as now sufficiently proved, that the religious instruction of children is possible I will proceed one step further and endeavor to show, in the second place, that it is right to impart it.

What it is possible to do is not always right to be done: but, in respect to giving children some knowledge of religion, I hope it may be shown that parents have a right to give it, if they are disposed; and are not liable to be impeached for any inconsistency, or for taking any improper liberty with their children. In what age do I live, that there should be any call for a vindication like this! But we proceed, to show the right of parents in this respect.

It may, perhaps, be taken for granted, that parents have a right to give their children some instruction of some kind or other. They may teach them to speak their mother tongue, to read, or they may obtain others to teach them, they may have them instructed in grammar, and in other branches of school education. Parents have a right, it will be conceded, to train their children to some employment, and give them much instruction relating to the ordinary concerns of domestic and social life as they judge expedient and useful. All this is readily granted; and none object, that

by it any injury is done to the child, or that any natural right is infringed. But what shall we say respecting the right of giving children religious instruction?

It is not strange, that violent opposition to religion should have invented every mode of attacking and destroying it; and that among other methods it resorted to this, namely, asserting that it was wrong to give religious instruction. But it was right, I suppose, to give this irreligious instruction to parents.

But why wrong to give religious instruction to children? It is said to be an infringement of their liberty; exposing them to errors and depriving them of the freedom of choosing a religion for themselves. This is the whole weight of the objection. Let us admit it, if reasonable; and if not, let us reject it. If this reasoning could be supposed valid against religious instruction, it would be equally so against other kinds: And I think, one may modestly undertake, to show, that if, on this principle, religious instruction is wrong, it is wrong, likewise to give that instruction to which we have already referred. Let the child grow up untaught to speak English that he may choose a language for himself—give him no instruction as to reading, for you may, possibly, instruct him wrongly and lead him into some erroneous mode of reading—as for grammar—wait till the grammarians have settled all their disputes.—

Do not teach your sons how to carry on a farm for there are different opinions, your mode may not in all respects, be best—you deprive your son of his liberty by instructing him in your way—let him grow up in entire ignorance, and then he will be better able to choose for himself. You see then, what this specious reasoning about leaving children at their liberty amounts to, when applied to other subjects. I venture to assert that it would reduce us to absolute barbarism in one or two generations.

“Let them grow up and choose for themselves.” Will they be better able to choose for themselves, when you have left them ignorant of the very first principles which may assist their choice. You may give them no instruction on religious subjects, but they will form some crude conceptions and these will render a choice more difficult than your riper instructions. There will be those who will endeavor to prejudice their minds against every thing serious: and will this prepare them for a more correct judgment? You do not thus leave your children at liberty to judge without any bias: for, so far as they are influenced by your opinions, they will be induced by your neglect of giving them religious instruction, to believe that all religion is vain, else you would have taught them its doctrines and its duties, as you taught them other things which you considered important. Let every pa-

rent, therefore, understand that by giving their children no religious instruction they are exciting a strong prejudice against all religion, and doing as much as to say to their children, “It is all a fiction.” But, perhaps it may be replied that such children are still at liberty to choose religion, if they ever have any inclination. And if you give your children religious instruction and such as you esteem to be most judicious and important; are they not still, left to choose for themselves, if they see cause to change in any respects their religious views. You may be parents, in this respect, and cause your children to be instructed—and still not assume to be Popes, and claim an absolute infallibility from which your children shall never make an appeal.

Though, in accompanying the many important truths with which you store the memories of your children, there may be some exposure to error—it is still right to impart religious instruction.—Though you are not to expose them to well known and pernicious errors, yet the evident and important truths which will be imparted by such serious instruction will do them vastly more good, than the supposed errors can do them injury. And you will be much more liable to the charge of injustice and cruelty to your children, by depriving them of opportunities of imbibing those fundamental truths and maxims, which should lead them to fear



God and to keep his commandments ; than you would be to expose them to the possibility of such error, as may not be inconsistent with their morals or their piety.

I hope we may now in view of the reasons, which have been offered, assert with the confidence of truth, that it is the right of parents to cause their children to be religiously instructed. They have a right to give immediate personal instruction to their offspring, in their families on the Sabbath and at other times, if they choose. They have a right to cause them to be thus taught at schools. It is as much the right and privilege of a parent to request this branch of instruction to be imparted to their children at school, as any other branch of learning. Nor have those who wave the right in their own case any more right to forbid those who are disposed to have their own children religiously instructed at school, than they have to forbid grammar, or arithmetic, or geography, or history or any branch to which some are attending, while others are omitting it. And teachers have as perfect and full a right to give religious lessons to those children, whose parents do not absolutely forbid it, as they have to give any other lessons. I have attempted to show, first, the possibility, and secondly, the right of giving religious instruction to children. So far, I trust our way is sufficiently clear.

But as that may be possible which may still not be right, so it may in some cases be abstractly considered right to do what still we may not, in duty be bound to perform. It is therefore proper to show,

In the third place, that it is a duty to give religious instruction to children.

1. If parents are allowed to have any authority over their children ; then, it is easy to see that parents and children are under the authority of that Heavenly parent in whom we all live and move and have our being. But the religious instruction of children is what that parent requires. He required Jews to teach their children his precepts diligently, when they sat in their houses, and when they walked by the way, when they laid down, and when they rose up. It is the same as a divine command to all parents to give their children religious instruction, when they read the commendation bestowed on Abraham by the Supreme, in the following terms. "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him; and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment." The wise man has given this general rule—"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." But not to multiply passages unnecessarily, let me only adduce one from the epistles of Paul. "Parents, provoke not your children

to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Thus do the scriptures enjoin this duty—and show it to be the will and command of God, that it should be performed. And were not the duty so expressly and fully enjoined, it might be argued from other considerations.

2. It is, indeed, the duty of parents to instruct their offspring on subjects, by no means so important as those involved in a religious education. It is their duty to impart those maxims of conduct, which they may need in life—and to see that their minds are furnished betimes, with those useful rudiments of common learning which our happy country, and especially, this happy part of it, render easily attainable. But if this is their duty, how much more is it binding upon them to connect with their other instructions, that which will be so necessary to make the other useful. How much more are they bound to inculcate those moral and religious principles, which will keep their children from being more injurious to the world by their other learning—and lead them to live, and act, and think, as under the inspection, and subject to the control of a Supreme Being—and dependant on him for happiness here and hereafter.

I hope we are now prepared, in the fourth place, for the conclusion, that if to give religious

instruction to children is what is possible to be done, and right to be done—and a duty; then it is no less evident, that it is a *very important* duty. If any good may be done by religious instruction, great good may be done. Deep and lasting impressions may be made, favorable to virtue and piety. The influence of early education is allowed to be very great; and, therefore, the duty of the parents and instructors of children, is very commanding in respect to affording important religious instruction. Early should those holy principles be instilled, which children may afterwards find to be the support of their virtue, the solace of their affliction, their hope in death, and their preparation for the state of retribution.—If it is a duty for parents to regard the welfare of their children, then to advance their highest interests, must be their most important duty.

Be persuaded, therefore, parents, as you regard your children and your duty, to be not merely willing, but forward, to improve every opportunity of furnishing your children with a rich store of useful knowledge. Such instruction enforced as it should be, by your own example, will be to them the most valuable inheritance you can leave them—and the most likely to dispose them to bless your memory, when they are called to weep over your grave.

## REVIEW.

(Concluded from page 151.)

In the sixth chapter of his Essay, however, Mr. B. has answered the following *objection* to his views of the subject.

“The scriptures evidently teach that Christ died in the room and stead of sinners; and if he did thus die, they must be exempted. If A. enlist into the army, and B. offer to go in his room, and is accepted, most certainly A. is exempted from service. So, if Christ really tasted death for every man, and died in their *room* and *stead*, then they must be exempted.” P. 167.

In reply he states, that those passages of scripture, which have been considered as teaching that Christ died actually in our room and stead, are to be considered metaphorically; otherwise there could be no grace in the deliverance of a sinner from punishment. They may be regarded as communicating this general idea, that as B's consenting to perform the services, which A. stood engaged to perform, is the ground, on which A. is released; and as the payment of money, or some other equivalent, is the ground of the release of a captive; so the death of Christ is the ground, on which believing sinners are pardoned and saved.” He states further, that the execution of a righteous penalty on a transgressor is said to remove his guilt or his desert of punishment; and hence, that if sinners could endure this penalty,

and yet live, their guilt, or ill desert, could thus be removed.—

But, if their guilt, or ill desert, could thus be removed, and this were considered a valuable object, in executing the penalty of the law, he admits, this is an object, which the death of Christ does not, and cannot effect, because guilt, or ill desert, is a personal thing, not to be removed but by the suffering of the penalty, by the guilty person himself. He states, however, that it was not necessary, in order to make a full atonement, that the sufferings of Christ should actually remove the guilt of sinners. It was sufficient, if these sufferings removed those obstacles, in the way of their pardon, which have been considered. Had this ill desert been removed, it would have precluded both the necessity and the possibility of pardon, according to the common use of this term.— For he adds,

“If, then, Christ had removed or taken away the ill desert of sinners, there could be no grace manifested in their salvation. In this sense, therefore, the death of Christ cannot be considered as being in the room and stead of sinners. Hence, whether the scriptures do teach, that Christ died in the room and stead of sinners, must depend entirely, on the meaning, which is affixed to these terms.— If we understand by them, that the sufferings of Christ have answered all the purposes which the execution of the penalty of



the law would have answered and occasioned, provided it had been possible for sinners to survive this execution, both in respect to supporting the divine government, and removing the ill desert of sinners, it is evident, the scriptures teach no such doctrine. But, if nothing more be intended, by Christ's dying in our room and stead, than that he suffered that it might clearly appear, that God would support and honor his law, that the divine character might be clearly exhibited and vindicated, and the highest interest of the universe secured; in short, that God might be just to his law, to his character, and to his kingdom, and yet the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus; then it is, unquestionably, a doctrine plainly taught in scripture.

"If, however, this be all that is intended, by this form of speech, in our room, and in our stead, it may not be unsuitable to inquire whether other words, and forms of expression, might not be used which would communicate the idea, with much greater clearness. Notwithstanding the long practice even of the best writers has sanctioned the use of these terms; yet surely we should not on that account, indulge such a fondness for them, as to refuse to lay them aside, if continuing the use of them would endanger the salvation of one soul, who, through ignorance, or willingness to be deluded, might infer from them, that since Christ has died in our room

and stead, we certainly cannot be liable to death. If, indeed, the terms were scriptural, these observations might with more appearance of justice, be deemed sacrilegious; though, even in that case they would, like many other scripture phrases, need explanation. But, the truth is, that though they have been so long and so often used, that many probably, are scarcely aware of the fact, yet they really have no place in the Bible." pp. 171—173.

The passages, "Christ died for us; for the ungodly; for sinners, &c." are far from proving, that he died in our room and stead; they prove rather that he died for our benefit, or on our account. But they do not prove, that we must have been made a sin offering, in the same sense that he was, if he had not died for us. For although it is said, "he died for our sins," yet no one will affirm that he died instead of our sins.

Indeed, the sufferings of Christ were not strictly punitive: they were not the very punishment due to sinners, or the literal penalty of the law. They were a substitute for something. And when we recollect the obstacles, in the way of God's pardoning sinners, which they were designed to remove, and did remove, we may readily perceive the precise object of their substitution. In the author's language, "the sufferings of Christ were a substitute for the execution of the penalty, rather than for the penalty itself."

For it is obvious, that the penalty of the law, and the execution of the penalty, are distinct things. The penalty consists in *sufferings*, endured by the guilty : but the execution of the penalty, consists in the *infliction* of sufferings, by the offended Lawgiver. And since it is the execution of the penalty, on transgressors, which would display the holiness and justice of God, so the sufferings of Christ, in order to display this holiness and justice, must be a substitute for the *execution* of the penalty. As Mr. B. says,

“ It is evident, the execution of the penalty of a law, and the suffering of an offender, which is a consequence of such an execution, are distinct things, and exhibit different characters. One exhibits the character of him, who enforces the law ; and the other, the character of him who suffers the penalty. Since these are different things, it must be evident also, that the sufferings of Christ must have been designed as a substitute for the execution of the penalty, rather than for the punishment due to sinners. For it must be obvious, that the sufferings of Christ must have been designed to exhibit the character of God, honoring and supporting his law, showing his opposition to sin, and promoting the interest of his kingdom, rather than to make an exhibition of the character of sinners, in endless misery, enduring the punishment due to them

for sin, and thus removing their ill desert.” pp. 180, 181.

Hence, it is evident that Christ did not die in the *room* and *stead* of sinners ; or that his sufferings were not the very penalty of the law, but were a substitute for the *execution* of its penalty. And it follows, that his sufferings did not actually remove the guilt of sinners. But this view of the atonement leads us to “ an inquiry concerning imputation,” which occupies the seventh chapter of Mr. B’s Essay. His statement of the case is,

“ It has been the opinion of many, that for guilty men to be justified through Christ, it is necessary that his righteousness should be so imputed to him, as to be a ground on which they may be considered righteous in law. For, say they, there must be a perfect righteousness somewhere, to lay a foundation for justification ; and as mankind have no such righteousness of their own, the righteousness of Christ must be imputed to them.”

Now, the inquiry is, whether this is necessary, and whether the righteousness of Christ, is *in fact*, so imputed to believers, as to become their righteousness, in a law sense. Do the scriptures anywhere affirm, that Christ’s righteousness is so imputed to them, as to become their righteousness ? We venture to question, whether there be any such revelation as this. We have never seen those

passages, which convey such a sentiment: nor have we been led to suppose, that such an imputation of Christ's righteousness is necessary.

We well remember, that Abraham's faith was said to be imputed to him for righteousness: and that from this, it was argued that the faith of every believer is imputed to him for righteousness — But, we have yet to learn from scripture, that Christ's righteousness is so imputed to them, as to become *their* righteousness. Indeed, it seems impossible, that their faith *can* so receive the righteousness of Christ, as to make it *their own*.

Were it admitted, however, that Christ's righteousness is supposed to be thus imputed, it is still liable to this capital objection; that it rests the salvation of sinners wholly on the principles of law and justice, which is contrary to the whole tenor of the gospel. For, if Christ, as a legal substitute for any part of mankind, has suffered the full penalty of the law, then justice, in every sense, is satisfied; it can require no more sufferings. Nay, justice will then demand their exemption from punishment. On this ground, therefore, no forgiveness or grace could be exercised, in releasing them from punishment; it would only be treating them justly.

"So, if Christ, as a legal substitute for believers, has obeyed the law, so that God justifies them, and makes them happy, out of

respect to the righteousness of Christ, *considered as their's*, then saints are really justified by works, in a law sense; not, indeed, by their own works, but by the works of their legal substitute. If saints are justified by the obedience of their substitute, it is the same thing as if they were justified by their own obedience, so far as it respects their being justified by works. It is evidently, all on the principles of law and justice; and there is no grace in the matter.— If a man engage to perform a certain work, for a reward which is proposed, it makes no difference, whether he do the work himself, or procure another to do it for him. Let the work be done according to agreement, and he is entitled to his reward. So, if Christ has done for believers, the work which the law required them to do, God is now bound, on the principles of strict justice, to bestow the promised reward, eternal life. There is no grace, but stern, unbending justice here."— pp. 202, 203.

But, if it be said, saints are unworthy in themselves, and so do not deserve happiness; still, they are not unworthy, in the sense in which they are viewed as possessing Christ's perfect righteousness. So far from it, that in this sense, they merit eternal happiness, by their substituted perfect righteousness. However guilty in themselves, still, when viewed as having a perfect righteousness from Christ, they must be made



happy, according to strict justice. For, on this scheme, they have suffered, in him, all that they deserve to suffer. And, as all their ill desert is thus done away, and they now have a perfect righteousness, they can make a legal demand of happiness. Nor, does it alter the case, to affirm that it was grace in Christ, to take the place of transgressors. It removes no difficulty. If he suffered and obeyed as a legal substitute, there is no grace in exempting believers from punishment, and in making them happy! All yet, proceeds on the principles of law and justice; contrary to the plain testimony of the gospel, that the salvation of sinners is all of grace.—For, in the gospel, their salvation is said to be, not of works, nor of law; but entirely by another dispensation. Besides, the scheme before us, is absurd in itself. In a law sense, one being *cannot* suffer, nor obey, for another. The law does not admit the obedience of one being, in behalf of another. Its unbending language is—“The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon *him*: and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon *him*.”

Now, these objections to the doctrine of imputation, appear insuperable. We know not how they can be obviated. And from the view already given of the nature and design of the atonement, we do not feel it necessary, that they should be obviated. For, if the atonement of Christ has re-

moved all the obstacles, which opposed their salvation, we are unable to see, why God may not *pardon* the guilt, or *remit* the just punishment of believers. And having done this, why he may not make them eternally happy in heaven, on account of Christ's atonement; even, though they remain utterly unworthy in themselves. Indeed, the tendency of this procedure is such, as will prepare them to unite in the very song of the redeemed, “Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins, in his own blood; to him be glory forever and ever.”

It must, however, be remembered, that faith in the blood of Christ is necessary, that sinners may be saved. This was remembered by the author. And in the eighth chapter of his Essay, he has assigned some reasons *why* this faith is necessary. Indeed, this is as necessary, in order to obtain salvation, as the atonement itself was; and substantially for the same reasons. For, if God should pardon the sinner, who has no faith, and who, of course, is not reconciled to the Savior, he would pardon and save one who is yet a rebel: one, who is yet impenitent and opposed to the law. He could not, therefore, show due respect for his law; nor, indeed, for his government. To pardon one who has no faith in Christ, would be to give up the honor of the law, and the rectitude of his government. Indeed, if God should pardon and justify

sinners, who have no faith, he could not appear just to his own character.

“By the requirements and threatenings of his law, he manifested a regard for holiness, and an abhorance of sin. In giving his beloved son to die on the cross, to make an atonement for sin, he manifested the same feelings, and displayed the same glorious character. But, should he now justify those, who have no faith in the atonement, no acquiescence in it, and no approbation for it, he would counteract, and contradict what has thus been manifested in his law, and in the sufferings and death of Christ. In doing this, he would justify those who were opposed to Christ, which would be an implicit acknowledgment that their opposition was right; indeed, it would be taking part with them in their opposition. Hence his character would appear inconsistent and suspicious. Holy beings would be at a loss, what opinion they might form, respecting his real feelings. They might fear him; but they would lose their confidence, and would scarcely find it in their hearts to love him. Since, therefore, all who are destitute of faith in the blood of Christ are opposed to him, it is impossible that any such can ever be justified.—Faith in the blood of Christ is, therefore, indispensibly necessary to justification. Christ is not the end of the law for righteousness to unbelievers, or to them that

have not faith; but he ‘is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth.’” pp. 226, 227.

Besides, pardon would do the unbeliever no good. Admit him to heaven and he could not be happy there, so long as he remains an unbeliever, and unreconciled to the Divine character and government. But, if this view of the subject is correct, it overthrows at once a leading argument in support of the doctrine of universal salvation. Though Christ’s atonement is sufficient for the salvation of all men, it is yet of no avail for them that do not *believe* in his atonement. Hence, if the doctrine of universal salvation is argued from the sufficiency of Christ’s atonement, the doctrine of universal *sanctification* and *faith* must also be maintained, or the argument is utterly inconclusive. But the fulness of the atonement furnishes no evidence of universal sanctification. Nor do we find this evidence, in any part of the bible. We, therefore, learn the utter fallacy of the hope of salvation, without faith in Christ, notwithstanding the complete fulness of his atonement.

We now come to the “Conclusion” of Mr. B’s Essay, in which he takes notice of several opinions, respecting the atonement, which, if his views are correct, are obviously erroneous. But, passing over these, we shall attend briefly to some of those inferences, which result from what

he has said. One is, "that the atonement is, in a strict and proper sense, for all mankind."— Christ tasted death for every man; for the non-elect, as much as for the elect. Indeed, election has no more to do with the atonement, than with creation, resurrection, or the general judgement. From the necessity and nature of the atonement, it must obviously be universal. It was necessary to remove obstacles, which opposed the pardon of sinners.— And it has been shown, not only what these were, but that they were removed by the sufferings of Christ. So that nothing now opposes the pardon of any sinner whatever, of the human race, who *believes* in the atonement, or complies with the terms, on which salvation is offered.— But neither the sinner's compliance, nor his non-compliance, can, in any degree, affect the nature or the extent of the atonement. Nor does the extent of the atonement confer an obligation on Jehovah to save all men, or even any man. He remains at full liberty to act in this momentuous concern, as the greatest general good may, in his wisdom, require.

Another important inference is, that the nature of the atonement does not decide the question, whether the greatest good *requires* the salvation of a great, or a small number. For, if God had designed the salvation of only a small number, the same atone-

ment was necessary, to make their pardon consistent, which the salvation of all men would require. In fact, this atonement was necessary, that God might consistently *offer* pardon to sinners: because, if he had designed to leave them wholly to their own choice about accepting it, still, he could not consistently make the *offer*, on any terms, except those, on which it would be consistent to pardon those who accepted. For, notwithstanding all the atonement has done, the *unbelief* of sinners must be removed, or they cannot be saved. But the atonement does not remove this: nor is its nature such, as requires God to remove it. Indeed, there is no evidence, that in *all* cases, it ever will be removed. The mere goodness of God does not prove that none will be left in unbelief and misery, in a future world. There are some, who evidently remain in unbelief, through the present life. And if this is consistent with divine goodness, there is no evidence, that their future state also, may not be sinful and miserable. For this *may* subserve the divine glory in a future world as well as in the present world. If however, God should give faith to all, he might save them, on the ground of atonement, and yet promote his glory and the good of the universe, as extensively as would have been done, by executing the law.

But it does not hence follow, that God *will* give all men faith, nor, that by so doing, he would



promote his glory and the general good, in the *highest degree*. He might do this, in as great a degree, as could have been done, by executing the law : but the execution of the law could not have promoted his glory and the good of the universe in the *highest degree*. For, if it could, the law would have been executed. Indeed, neither the execution of the law, nor the atonement of Christ, *in itself considered*, is capable of promoting the *highest glory* of God, or the *best interest* of his kingdom. If one could, for the same reason the other must. But here a question arises, which, notwithstanding the length of this article, we are disposed to answer, in the author's own words. For we think it worthy of serious attention.

"It may be asked, then, why should infinite wisdom choose the method of atonement, rather than the execution of the law ? The answer is, the atonement, though it does not of itself promote any object, which might not have been promoted by the execution of the law, yet it opens a way, in which God can introduce *other measures*, and accomplish *other purposes*, which could not have been introduced and accomplished, in case the law had been executed ; and these other measures and purposes promote his glory and the interest of his kingdom in the *highest degree*. If the penalty of the law had been executed upon all transgressors, God never

could have displayed his *justice* and *mercy* to the degree, in which they now appear. The atonement, however, opens the way, in which God makes this display, in the highest perfection.

"It is by means of atonement, that God has opportunity of displaying his justice in the highest degree. If the penalty of the law had been executed on all transgressors, it is true the justice of God would have appeared in some degree. It would have appeared in as great degree as that state of things would have required. But, it would not have appeared to that degree, which the present state of things, under the gospel, requires. For, in order that the glory of divine justice may fully appear, it is necessary that the evil nature of sin should fully appear. But this never could have appeared to the extent, that it now does, if atonement had not been made.

"It could not have been seen, that sin was so exceedingly malignant, and mankind so exceedingly full of it, as to be ready to reject a Savior and his salvation, when freely offered. If any one, except the Supreme Being himself, had informed angels, that mankind had become so exceedingly depraved, that even if a Savior should be provided, and salvation should be freely offered, on the most reasonable condition, they would all make light of it, and ungratefully reject the offer, it is probable angels would have doubted whether such wickedness were possible.--

If mankind, antecedently to the revelation of God's purposes of mercy, had been so informed, probably, they too, would have rejected the idea, and with indignation. All this, however, is true, and must be seen, before the justice of God, in his opposition to sin, can fully appear. But this is what never could have been seen, if the penalty of the law, without atonement, had been inflicted.—Neither could it have been seen, if, when atonement was made, God had given faith to every sinner. Because, in that case, it never could have appeared, that the wickedness of mankind was so great, that if left to their own choice, they would forever reject a bleeding Savior. Yet all this must appear, in order that the justice of God, in his opposition to this wickedness, may fully be seen. And, if the nature of sin is really so bad, that a sinner, left to himself, will continue his opposition to divine grace, during eternity, then this must be manifested, in order that the justice of God, in punishing such wickedness, may *fully appear*.

“*Divine grace*, also, must forever appear great, in proportion to the greatness of the wickedness that is pardoned. If, then, God would display the full extent of the riches of his grace, to the view of intelligent beings, he must so order his providence respecting sinners, as to make a clear manifestation of the evil nature of sin, even though it should be at the

expense of leaving some to their own perverse and wicked choice, to be forever *living examples*, of what all sinners must have been, had not divine grace plucked them as brands from the burning.

“Thus it is evident, that the glory of God may require that the extent of his justice, and the riches of grace, be forever manifested by leaving some sinners to their own chosen way, in perpetual unbelief; that he may, as saith the apostle, “show his wrath and make his power known on vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction.” pp. 259—264.

He also remarks, that holy beings may be constantly benefitted by such a display: and, indeed, will be deeply interested in beholding the depth of sin, and the measure of punishment, from which they have been saved. And he adds,

“What, then, if the sufferings of Christ do answer all the valuable purposes, which the execution of the law would have answered, provided no atonement had been made? Does this prove that the execution of the law can answer no valuable purpose *now*, when, in fact, the guilt of sinners is actually increased to an incomparable degree, by their sinning against the atonement?” p. 266.

This, surely, is a solemn subject. But it is evidently in accordance with the truth. From what God has revealed of himself and his purposes, we are confident he *will promote* his own glory, and

the best interest of his kingdom, in the highest degree; and that he has adopted the *best method* to accomplish this object. And since Christ has declared, the wicked "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal," there is no reason to doubt, that unbelievers in Christ *ought* to be, and *will* be punished according to the demerit of their sins, though a full atonement has been made. For it has been shown, that the extent of the atonement has nothing to do with the number, who are actually saved; because its design was to remove obstacles, which *opposed* their pardon and salvation. This number was fixed, in the gracious purpose of God, by a supreme regard to his own glory, and the best interest of his kingdom.—And, from the very nature and design of the atonement, it is evident that the punishment of every unbeliever is just and necessary, though a full atonement has been made.

Accordingly, in his "Appendix," Mr. B. states, that if his view of the atonement is correct, it sets aside one principal argument in support of universal salvation. Of this, we have already taken a brief notice; and we still think it was effectually overthrown. The author then remarks, "I knew of but two sources from which evidence, [of this doctrine] can be derived, viz.—the analogy of nature, and the doctrines of revelation." These,

he proceeds to examine. And by a candid and faithful examination of each one, separately, he shows clearly, that neither of them furnishes the least evidence in support of that doctrine. If we are not deceived, its advocates will find, on a careful examination of this appendix, that even these sources of evidence, are completely destroyed; that both the analogy of nature, and the doctrines of revelation, instead of supporting, are in direct opposition to their favorite doctrine. But, should any one, then ask him, *in what sense*, Christ can be the Savior of the world; his answer is,

"In the same sense that a physician may be said to be the physician of a whole town, when there is no other one, and this one is abundantly able to do all the business, if the people would apply to him; while, at the same time, one half of the sick have no faith in him, and will not apply to him, and actually die for want of his help."—He then concludes—

"And now, reader, let me tell you, that Jesus Christ is your Savior; but if you do not believe in him, and make application to him for pardon, you must die in your sins, and perish forever. On the authority of his word, I assure you, 'He that believeth not, shall be damned.' " p. 294.

We have time to say but little, respecting the Essay itself, or the manner of its execution. That every sentiment of the author in this work, is perfectly correct, we



would not assume the responsibility of affirming. Yet, as a whole, we readily state, that in our opinion, the view here given of the atonement, is according to the tenor of scripture, and therefore correct. In our examination, we found nothing, which appeared so erroneous, as to demand critical animadversion; nor so dangerous, as to merit an expression of disapprobation. For this reason, we have not detained our readers with critical remarks, on Mr. B's sentiments. And we have only to request those, who may take an interest in the work, and have not seen it, to examine for themselves. If they do not perfectly accord with the author, in their views of the atonement, still, they will find a specimen of close thought, and of connected, powerful argument. We think they will find the scheme consistent with itself.—Probably, if they have not thoroughly examined the subject, they will find something new. And should they find it difficult to disprove the correctness of the scheme, or to invalidate the arguments, in support of it, we shall not think it strange or unaccountable.

The arrangement of its parts is judicious. The subject for discussion is clearly stated. The necessity of an atonement is fairly shown. Its nature, design, and extent, are made obvious and intelligible; while its connection with other doctrines of the bible is duly regarded. In general, a

due attention is paid to each of the several parts of the work.—We noticed a few things, however, which had the appearance of repetition, and were at first under the impression, that on some parts the author had dwelt too long.—But, on reflecting that the work contains some things, which to us were new, on an important, difficult subject; and especially, that it was professedly designed for common readers, who may need to have a more full exhibition of truth before them, we were satisfied, that all this might be useful. As an entire work, however, it is obviously condensed; and for the magnitude, and matter of its contents, very limited.

His style, as will appear from the extracts, is plain and natural. It is what may be expected from an author, deeply engaged in investigating a difficult subject, and anxious to make his readers fully understand him. He takes no pains to round his periods; he makes no efforts to amuse his readers with sound instead of sense. We saw no instance, in which sense was sacrificed, or perspicuity impaired, for the sake of ornament. Yet the style is neither vulgar nor vapid; nor is it without specimens of richness and grandeur. Its main features, however, are strength and perspicuity.

We only add, that although it embraces a controverted subject, the work before us is written with a commendable spirit. It breathes

no calumny, nor personal invective; it makes no attack on the character of other men; and utters no proscription of an opponent. On the contrary, it is well fitted to advance the cause of truth in our guilty world. A candid perusal of it, we think, will impart consolation to the people of God, and may serve to convince the impenitent, that, unless they believe in Christ, his atonement will be the means of their greater guilt, and their deeper condemnation.

---

[From the *Utica Repository*.]

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY—BY BUNYANUS.  
CHAPTER I.

In journeying through the wilderness of this world, it happened that I fell in company with a man of singular parts, whose name was Mr. *Sagacity*. And having far to travel in the same road, I enjoyed the pleasure of his society, and the benefit of his conversation, for many days. Knowing that he was the same person who had formerly given a relation of the adventures of certain pilgrims, in their progress from the city of Destruction to the Celestial Country I embraced the opportunity of inquiring further respecting them, and was much delighted with hearing the old gentleman relate again the various perils the pilgrims encountered, for the love they bore to the Prince Immanuel, the wonder-

ful deliverances which they had experienced by the strength of his arm and the happy termination of their journey. When the good man dwelt on the joys of the state in which they now are, and spoke of those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, I felt my heart burn with strong desire to go also on pilgrimage, to be a follower of them who through faith and patience have inherited the promises, that I too might share in the glories of the New Jerusalem, and might sit down with the general assembly of pilgrims at the marriage supper of the Prince Immanuel.

So strongly had these things taken possession of my mind, that when I laid me down to sleep at the inn, I had no sooner closed my eyes, than my imagination returned to the pilgrims and their adventures. Methought I stood upon an eminence, which commanded an extensive prospect of the surrounding country, and allowed me to extend my view far to the east. On my right in the plain below, was the city of Destruction, with the towns of Stupidity, Sensuality and Carnal Security, and the extensive regions of the province of Darkland. To the south was Mount Sinai, and just beyond it the town of Formality, the village of Morality, and the other towns and villages of Pharisee land. Just before me was the wicket gate, which stood at the head of the narrow way; and from



his gate, stretching due east, far as the eye could reach, lay the road to the Celestial City.

On directing my attention to the valley below me, I perceived that the suburbs of the city of Destruction were extended close up to the wicket gate; and that this part of the city, as well as every other was exceedingly populous. Fixing my eyes upon the inhabitants, I observed that all was bustle and confusion among them. All appeared eagerly engaged, and exerting all their powers, in the pursuit of something, but what, I could not at first distinctly perceive. On drawing nearer, and looking more attentively, I could more clearly distinguish what their employments were. Some of them were endeavoring to climb a high hill, called Worldly Honor. The sides of this hill were very steep, and at the same time very slippery, so that few of the climbers ever reached the summit. And those few who did reach the summit, I perceived did not remain there; but presently their heads grew dizzy, and they tumbled headlong, to be seen no more.—Many were the expedients resorted to, in order to mount up this dangerous hill. Some mounted upon the shoulders of others, that they might reach a place where there was foot hold. And all seemed willing at first to take others upon their shoulders, with the expectation that when they were up, they would assist them in turn.—But these expectations were sel-

dom realized; for those who were up seemed so intent upon mounting higher, as not to regard those below any further than they needed their help. Many who had reached a considerable elevation were pulled down by others, who were desirous of taking their places. And many who thus pulled others down, fell with them to the bottom. Some having secured the ladder of popular favor, ascended quickly to a great height, when the ladder suddenly gave way, and their bones were broken with the fall.

Others I saw digging with vast labor in a mine called Worldy Gain, and burthening themselves with great quantities of the earth they brought thence. Many of those who descended into the mine I observed never came out again; but the earth often fell in upon them and buried them alive. Such occurrences however did not seem in the least to damp the ardor of the survivors, who continued digging with the same eagerness, though at the imminent hazard of their lives. The earth which was brought from the mine appeared to occasion many quarrels among those who possessed it. And when they carried it home, I saw that they were not able to sleep for fear that others should set upon them and take it away. Children often wished their parents dead, that they might get possession of what was in their hands; and as soon as their parents were out of the way, quar-



relled among themselves about the division. And I saw, moreover, that several very ill favored and dreadful shapes, called Fraud, and Lying and Perjury, and Murder, were continually walking about amongst the diggers, taking the earth from some and giving it to others. Those who received it from them seemed to exult for a few moments, in the possession; but soon another monster called Remorse, with viper hair and snaky whip, pursued them wherever they went.

Another part of the inhabitants I saw employing themselves very differently still. These were chiefly of the younger sort. In the midst of the city, ran several deep, turbid, sluggish streams, called the streams of Sensual Pleasure, the waters of which were mingled with vast quantities of mire, and filth, which were drained off from the streets and common sewers of the city, and continually sent forth the most offensive and pestilential exhalations. These streams, flowing together in the heart of the city, formed a vast whirlpool, called the Vortex of Dissipation, in which multitudes were continually swallowed up, and carried into the Dead Sea. To these foul streams vast crowds of both sexes were continually resorting, and with the greatest seeming eagerness were drinking down the foetid waters, with an insatiable thirst. Numbers were sailing down these streams to the Vortex of Dissipation, and many boys were bathing

in them, and sporting in the mire and filth.

When I had seen the inhabitants of the city thus employed, I said to myself these people cannot be in the enjoyment of right reason, they are certainly beside themselves. And what strengthened me in this persuasion was, that I saw no one among them who was at all satisfied with his present condition; but the mind of every one appeared like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. And notwithstanding that they found so little satisfaction in their pursuits, they still returned to them with as much eagerness as ever. And I saw, moreover, that every one had a heavy burden on his back like that which the pilgrim Christian had before he became a pilgrim; and that although these burdens seemed to me to be sufficiently heavy to sink them down to Tophet, yet none of them seemed to be sensible that he had any burden at all. And besides this, I perceived underneath the whole city a vast pit filled with combustible materials and burning with great fierceness, which had gradually worn away the ground on which the city stood, so that in many places it was a mere shell, and often tumbled under them, as if it were ready to crumble in pieces and plunge the whole city into the burning abyss below. And notwithstanding all this, they appeared to be as unconcerned, and as eagerly engaged in their various

employments as if there were no danger to be apprehended.

While I looked at them, and wondered at their conduct in their present circumstances, I observed one near me whose name was Revelation, to whom I addressed myself, and inquired if he could explain these things.

Then said he to me, this whole country was once under the dominion of the celestial king, who governed it with the greatest equity and mildness, and imposed no restraints upon the inhabitants, but such as were necessary for their own and the general good. The black tyrant, however, the implacable enemy of their king, found means to persuade them that the wholesome restraints they were under, were intolerable, and too grievous to be submitted to; and that if they would revolt from their lawful prince, and put themselves under his control, they should be exalted to great dignity, and enjoy unbounded liberty. They accordingly revolted from their rightful king, and became the subjects of the black tyrant.

But he has greatly deceived them, said I. He has so, replied Mr. Revelation; for instead of being highly exalted, and becoming as gods, which he promised them, they have debased themselves to the lowest depth of degradation, and have become the vilest of creatures. And instead of enjoying greater liberty, they are now the veriest slaves in the universe.

They do not appear to be in the enjoyment of right reason, said I.

Rev. They are not. "Their hearts are full of evil, and madness is in their hearts while they live." The black tyrant has blinded the eyes of their understanding. And so complete is his influence over them, that they do not perceive their bondage, nor the heavy burthens they have upon their backs.

They are greatly to be pitied, said I.

Rev. They are indeed; but they are more to be blamed.

How is that? said I. Do we not think a man excusable for what he does under the influence of lunacy, when he is not in the enjoyment of right reason?

Rev. We do so, when a man is under the influence of *natural* blindness, madness or lunacy.—But the madness of these people is of a peculiar nature. It is not *natural* but *moral*. They are entirely *voluntary* in their madness. The black tyrant could never have brought them under his power, without their consent. He can have no further influence upon them now, than they please to give him; and he cannot keep them in subjection a moment longer than they are his willing slaves.

But, have they no information, said I, of the danger to which they are exposed by remaining in the city?

Rev. They have the best information. I am continually employed in pointing out to them



this danger, and the way to escape it, through yonder gate.— I am always proclaiming that the wrath of the king is revealed from his throne against them; and pointing out to them the dangerous pit of fire and brimstone, over which they hang, and which is very soon to swallow up their whole city. But I am very little regarded. Some say that I am an impostor, and they will not listen to me. Others say, my language is so mysterious, they cannot understand me if they try, and they will not try. Others say, I tell some truth and some lies, and they cannot tell what to depend upon. Others admit that all I say is true, in some sense or other; but they will not believe I mean as I say. Others say, they are too much employed just now, they have no time to listen to me; and bid me call again at a more convenient season.

There is one, named Conscience, who seconds my designs as far as he can. He never contradicts the opinions of those he addresses, but often crosses their inclinations. He bids them attend to my instructions, and always act according to their best judgment of what is right. He often follows them into their secret retirements and expostulates with them upon the folly and wickedness of their conduct; and sometimes he breaks in upon them in the midst of their carousals, and terrifies them with the tidings of what is coming upon them. But, they are far from being pleased with his admonitions; and if they cannot contrive to silence him, they usually drown his voice in the noise and bustle which they raise. Evangelist also often goes and preaches to them, and warns them to flee from the wrath to come. And Goodwill, at the gate,

stands with the doors wide open, night and day, with his hands stretched out towards them, saying, in the most affectionate manner, "come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Upon hearing these words, I cast my eyes towards the gate, and saw a crowd of people collecting near it, round a venerable old man, whom I presently knew to be Evangelist. I therefore descended the hill and mingled with the crowd, that I might hear him preach. After prayer, he opened a book which he held in his hand, and read the following words; "Now then we are ambassadors for Immanuel as though the king did beseech you by us, we pray you in Immanuel's stead, be ye reconciled to the king."— After pointing out the nature of the controversy between the king and his rebellious subjects, and showing the unreasonableness and wickedness of their conduct, and the propriety of their submitting themselves unconditionally to the king, he pointed out to them, in the most affecting manner, what the Prince Immanuel had done to open the door of reconciliation; and urged them, by his dying groans and bitter agonies, to renounce their rebellion, and return to their allegiance. At the same time, he warned those who should refuse to submit, of the danger to which they were exposed from the dreadful pit, over which they were suspended, and the wrath of the king which was revealed against them. I was myself too much interested in the subject to notice the manner in which it affected the hearers while it was delivered; but when the preacher had dismissed the assembly, I observed a number of persons collected in a group, mak-



ing their remarks upon what they had heard.

I am weary, said Mr. Curiosity with hearing the same old tale, every time he preaches, he never gives us any thing that is new.

I am displeased; said Mr. Obstinate, that he always insists upon our giving up our side of the controversy, and never speaks of the king's yielding a little. For my part, I am willing to be on good terms with the king, provided he will give up his claims, and be reconciled to us.

For my part, said Mr. Pride, I cannot bear to hear him always talking of submission. And what is worse than all, he would have us submit unconditionally. He would have us throw ourselves into the hand of the king, to be disposed of at his sovereign pleasure. Perhaps he would banish or imprison the half of us. I am determined never to be reconciled to the king, unless he will previously stipulate never to bring me to trial, but to raise me to a throne; and then I shall be willing to submit, if he calls that submission.

The greatest fault I find, said Mr. Self-Complacent, is that he gives such an odious character to those who are in rebellion against the king. He will not allow that there is any moral goodness in them, but insists that they are wholly corrupt, and that every imagination of the thoughts of their heart is only evil continually. I consider this as a libel upon the whole of us.

I am displeased, said Mr. Secure, that he preaches so much terror. For my part, I have no idea of being frightened into submission to the king. I do not believe there is any such pit of fire and brimstone, as he speaks of, beneath our city, ready to swallow us up. I have a better opin-

ion of the king, than to suppose that he will punish the creatures which he has made, for any crimes which it is in their power to commit.

---

DEATH OF MR. NICHOLS, ONE OF THE  
AMERICAN MISSIONARIES, STATION-  
ED AT BOMBAY.

Late in the autumn Mr. Nichols commenced a tour in the southern Konkan, for the purpose of visiting, and to a certain extent newly organizing, the schools which had been established there. He expected to be absent a month. But before arriving at Rawadunda, about 16 miles below Bombay, he was taken ill with a fever, and reached that place with difficulty. Immediately on his arrival, the teachers of the school at Rawadunda furnished him with a bed and with every attention in his power. Hearing of his illness, Mr. Garrett proceeded to his assistance, and sending back word that he grew worse, Mr. Frost accompanied Mrs. Nichols, in a covered boat, to the place of his sickness, for the purpose of bringing him to Bombay, whither they conveyed him on the 9th of December, ten days after the commencement of his sickness. He was speechless, and much of the time insensible, and, about the middle of the following night, fell asleep and rested from his labors.

The funeral services were attended the next day in the chapel, to which many of the natives resorted, and were solemnly addressed by the Rev. Mr. Fyvie of Surat, who happened then to be at Bombay. The Rev. Messrs. Davis, Fyvie and Kenney visited Mr. Nichols repeatedly after his arrival at Bombay, and, with the Rev. Mr. Carr and the American Missionaries, accompanied his remains to the grave.

*Miss. Her.*